EVALUATION REPORT

Project number: 2010-1-NO1-LEO05-01839

By Anne Fox (WP 7)

Contents

Contents 2

Plan for evaluation in the Understand IT project 3

- Terms of Reference 3
- Aims of the evaluation plan (WP7) 3

Overall Methodology 4

- What was evaluated 5
- Questions to be answered through the evaluation 5
- Time-frame for the evaluation 6
- Evaluations undertaken 6
- Issues 7
- Conclusion 8

Appendix 1: WP results 10

- WP 1: Fact sheets 10
- WP 2: CCeD model adaptation 10
- WP 3: CCeD work sessions 10
- WP 4: Language & Cultural adaptations 11
- WP5: Pilot VITAE courses 12
- WP 6: Community of Practice 13
- WP 7: Evaluation 14
- WP 8: Generic Business Model for VITAE 15
- WP 9: Dissemination and exploitation 15
- WP 10: Project management 15

Appendix 2: Links to previous Evaluation Reports 17

PLAN FOR EVALUATION IN THE UNDERSTAND IT PROJECT

This document describes the way in which evaluation was undertaken in the UnderstandIT project.

Terms of Reference

Aims of the evaluation plan (WP7)

The aim of the evaluation plan is to document the procedures adopted for monitoring the project process, and ensuring quality control of the project results as well as an evaluation of the project process and project results. The Evaluation was therefore qualitative as well as quantitative and on-going from the beginning. The evaluation report was built step by step to follow the whole process.

Role & tasks of partners involved: The aims and methods of the evaluation plan are described in general terms in the original application for funding. Partners presented a plan of how to evaluate the work done in the work packages for which they were responsible and how to report back on it. The plan was discussed by the project partners and a final plan agreed upon.

Role and tasks of the Evaluation WP leader: The WP leader was to:

1. Assist the project coordinator in drafting a plan for the evaluation of the work done in each work package, the project results, and the project process. This plan was presented to the other project partners at seminar 1, and a final version agreed on.
2. be responsible for collecting the relevant evaluation data from the project partners during the project process, and in case of non delivery from a partner, alert the project coordinator
3. assist in making the interim report
4. assist in making an evaluation report at the end of the project

Working methods and techniques	Work package leaders formed a quality management team who met regularly online to implement the quality control plan. The plan was discussed by the project partners and a final plan agreed upon. The project coordinator collated results and potential consequences and made adjustments as necessary in consultation with the work package leaders.
Expected outcomes/results	Working with the WP leader, the other project partners included the project process monitoring in their project work, adjusted according to the project plans, and evaluated project deliveries. Expected results were: Project evaluation, interim report, final report
Quality management tools	The quality management team applied tools, methods and concepts of the following standards and guidelines: 1. The "Survival Kit for European Project Management" (www.sokrates.at/survivalkit, 2001), which incorporates the experiences of a number of coordinators and evaluators of European projects. 2. The "Handbook Virtual Teamwork, making cooperation work in Leonardo da Vinci projects Information, theory and practical Tips", published by the National Agency Leonardo da Vinci -The Netherlands 2004. Questionnaires, interview frames, focus group interviews, desk research, field research, quality management tool in e-learning developed by German partner Inter.research.

The overall success of the project was to be evaluated according to whether the template for the updated pilot courses as developed using online/distributed ConCurrent Design and the newly developed business model:

Are seen as clearly beneficial by VET management
Have increased participants' confidence in integrating ICT in their everyday teaching
Enable participants to help colleagues achieve the same confidence

OVERALL METHODOLOGY

Three main sources of guidelines were used In the preparation of the evaluation plan[1].

Evaluation of the main work of the UnderstandIT project was embedded within the experimental methodology of both the Concurrent Design approach and the Business Model Generator approach. This integrated approach to the design of a business model for up-skilling VET teachers in the area of ICT integration included

- paying attention to the design of the training,
- marketing of the training to relevant decision-makers,
- ensuring correct pricing and
- evaluation of the training by the course participants.

This builds on, for example, the approach proposed in the PAS 1032-1 Process model[2] for evaluating e-learning which was also a way of evaluating e-learning products over the whole process from conception to implementation but which was never widely adopted as it was presented in a demanding administrative framework which was viewed as a heavy additional burden. So evaluation is embedded into the UnderstandIT project as feedback and correction mechanisms are built into the CCeD and BMG methodologies. Nevertheless evaluation instruments were still needed and targets identified.

The novel elements of the project which particularly needed to be evaluated were:

- implementing CCeD online
- packaging the training product according to the application of the Business Model Generator approach

Work Package leaders produced targets which were supplemented by on-going qualitative evaluation at the end of every face to face meeting and every online meeting (see Appendix 1). The types of evaluation undertaken were discussed with each WP leader.
Eg In work package 3 the post-session questionnaire was described in the following way:

Introduction
The purpose of this document is to collect information regarding questions which we want to use in the survey after session one (WP03) in the UnderstandIT project.
Question categories
Category 1 - Closed questions with the Likert scale
We propose to use the Likert Scale with the following intervals for closed questions: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) neutral (neither agree nor disagree), (4) disagree and (5) strongly disagree.
Category 2 - Like category 1 pluss the N/A alternative
(1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) neutral (neither agree nor disagree), (4) disagree, (5) strongly disagree and (6) (N/A). The sixth alternative (NA) would typically be used for the Business Plan Team members, when we ask questions concerning the Vitea Course Team.
Category 3 - Open questions with free text
We propose to use some open questions with free text. Participants can write freely when answering questions in this category.

---

[1] The "Survival Kit for European Project Management" (www.sokrates.at/survivalkit, 2001), which incorporates the experiences of a number of coordinators and evaluators of European projects.
The "Handbook Virtual Teamwork, making cooperation work in Leonardo da Vinci projects Information, theory and practical Tips", published by the National Agency Leonardo da Vinci -The Netherlands 2004.
'A project manager's guide to evaluation' by J Hughes and L Nieuwenhuis 2005

[2] PAS 1032-1 Process for ensuring quality in e-learning

What was evaluated

There were four main areas to be evaluated:

- Project management
- Transfer of the CCeD model to online implementation
- Development of a generally applicable business model for VET training
- Transferability of the VITAE approach as a coaching model

It should be noted that the transfer of the CCeD process online and development of a business model for VET training such as VITAE were research exercises and therefore focus will be on the process more than the results.

Questions to be answered through the evaluation

The overall aim of the project was to find an effective way of developing and disseminating VET training, such as the VITAE approach, by devising a viable business model using the CCeD methodology transferred to the online medium.

Project management: Questions to be answered were the universally applicable ones about competent organization, efficient communication internally between project partners and externally to relevant target groups, sound financial management and the promotion of a good working relationship between the partners.
CCeD Online: The main question to be answered in this area was whether it is practical to transfer the CCeD process to an online environment. Evaluation examined whether the procedure implemented by the project was feasible and if not, then how, in concrete terms, it could be improved.
VET training business model: The question to be evaluated was whether the business model generator approach can be used to develop a viable generic business model in the VET training sector. We also looked at whether the model generated as a result of using the business model generator approach helps to disseminate adoption of a VET training product, in this case the VITAE approach.
The VITAE coaching approach: How effective has the project been in communicating the VITAE approach to those project partners who were not part of the original project team and to relevant stakeholders and potential course participants. How has the VITAE approach benefited from a change of emphasis from mentoring to coaching?
Valorisation: A model presented at the final meeting in Rome proposed the Microsoft Scaling Framework[3] as a basis for discussion.

The Scaling Framework BACK NEXT

DIMENSIONS OF SCALE	DEPTH	SUSTAINABILITY	SPREAD	SHIFT	EVOLUTION
POWER OF DIMENSION	EVALUATION AND RESEARCH	ROBUST DESIGN	REDUCING NEEDS FOR RESOURCES AND EXPERTISE	MOVING BEYOND BRAND TO CO-OWNERSHIP	RETHINKING THE MODEL
TRAPS TO AVOID	TRAP OF PERFECTION	TRAP OF MUTATION	TRAP OF OPTIMALITY	TRAP OF ORIGINATION	TRAP OF UNLEARNING
ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY	CREATING POWERFUL LEARNING	MEETING SPECIAL NEEDS	PROVIDING EFFICIENCIES AND SUPPORTS	ADAPTING AND SHARING	STUDY OF ADAPTATIONS
NEXT STEPS TO EXPLORE	UNDERSTANDING EFFECTIVENESS	COPING WITH DIFFICULT SETTINGS	DEVELOPING "LIGHT" VERSIONS	FOSTERING CO-DESIGNERS	EVOLVING DESIGN ASSUMPTIONS

[3] http://www.microsoft.com/education/demos/scale/

Time-frame for the evaluation

Evaluation was ongoing throughout the life of the project starting with the kick-off meeting. In that way, significant deviations from the planned timetable and objectives could be identified and dealt with swiftly.
The grey cells in the GANTT chart below show the expected activity in each work package according to the original application. This timetable was kept to more or less. The major deviation was the extension of the Language and Cultural adaptations work package 4 so that it could benefit from the experiences in the four pilot VITAE courses. The VITAE courses also extended a little longer than anticipated due to the depth of the materials contained in the revised VITAE course.

GANTT chart

UnderstandIT								
Project quarterly periods	**Q4 - 2010**	**Q1 - 2011**	**Q2 - 2011**	**Q3 - 2011**	**Q4 - 2011**	**Q1 - 2012**	**Q2 - 2012**	**Q3 - 2012**
Work Package								
1 Project analyses								
2 CCeD model adaptation								
3 CCeD work sessions								
4 Language & cultural adaptations								
5 VITAE courses								
6 CoP								
7 Evaluation								
8 Business model								
9 Dissemination								
10 Project management								
Project meetings								

It was relevant to evaluate progress just before the interim report due in September 2011 and then again just prior to the final report. For the mid-term evaluation it was relevant to pay specific attention to the whole CCeD process, both its adaptation to the online medium and the online work sessions themselves. The first two face to face meetings were also evaluated as well as project management in general. In this second major evaluation the focus was on the remaining two partner meetings, the 4 VITAE course pilots, CoP, the business model generator and dissemination and valorisation.

Evaluations undertaken

Online meetings: After each online meeting whether it was part of the CCeD process or simply a part of the project process, partners were asked to evaluate the meeting verbally at the end as well as completing electronic surveys, the results of which were later circulated and any necessary corrective action taken. This process enabled swift corrective reactions regarding for example the length of online meetings, breaks and structure of the agenda.

Face to face meetings: At the end of each of the four partner meetings time was set aside in the agenda for an evaluation from every partner present and a digital survey, the results of which were later circulated and any necessary action taken. This on-going evaluation meant that subsequent face to face meetings could take account of feedback from earlier meetings regarding timing, agenda and meeting procedures.

Pilot & demo courses: A full evaluation involving both developers, instructors and participants was undertaken for each of the pilot courses in the four partner countries. For the unplanned demo in May 2011, only the course participants were asked to fill in an evaluation survey.

Community of Practice: Performance criteria were agreed with the WP leaders beforehand and examined at the end of the project period.

Cultural adaptations: The products of this work package were the result of extensive consultation during partner meetings and were offered for comment once complete. The deadline for this work package was extended once it became clear that the final product would be of higher quality if it took account of feedback from the piloting of the VITAE courses in the four partner countries.

Business Model: The products of this work package were the result of extensive consultation during partner meetings and were offered for comment once complete. As a result of the CCeD process and partner pilots the products of this work package were tailored to reflect the results arising from CCeD. The main result here was that it proved impossible to develop a generic business plan and this led directly to the decision to produce an adaptive online tool for generating the business plan according to context instead.

Issues

In this section we will examine the main issues which the evaluation process revealed.

Communication during the project between the project partners

Online synchronous: Whilst several of the project partners had formerly used Skype and Blackboard Collaborate (formerly Elluminate and formerly Horizon/Wimba) for project meetings, Adobe Connect was new to many. The main difference was the extensive use of video to increase the feeling of presence and community during meetings. The synchronous online meetings were a critical element of trying out the ConCurrent Design process in distributed format. Whilst not as smooth as one might hope, this method of synchronous online meeting proved to be effective and allowed the partner network to produce the products demanded of the CCeD process.

Online asynchronous: The main approach to keeping in touch asynchronously was through the use of email with the implementation of a group email address which ensured that messages reached every partner automatically and through the use of Google Docs for the storage of project digital artifacts. The main advantage of using Google Docs was that all project partners had access to the most up to date versions of documents automatically. Over the 2 year period there has been a noticeable improvement in Google Docs which is not as sophisticated as Office products for example but we still had a few problems for example in opening dynamic pdfs. One disadvantage of the group email is that it was not granular leading to bilateral discussions which the rest of the project network did not have access to.

External: The project communicated with pilot course participants through various learning management systems including the project Community of Practice built as a result of WP 6. The project had an updated website and used a Twitter hashtag #understandit to disseminate news and useful, relevant links.

Adapting CCeD to the online medium

The CCeD process proved robust enough to transfer well to the online medium. The structure of the meetings was more or less the same as in the face to face version. It was perhaps more difficult for the facilitators to do their job which entails monitoring small group work and reverting to plenary when significant issues arise there. The meetings needed to be shorter, no longer than half a day and include official breaks, otherwise the process lost energy. The document repository in Google Docs also worked well for the ongoing building of the Design Documents over the 9 month process.

Piloting a CCeD devised course

During the distributed CCeD process it became apparent that there could not be one generic template for the pilot course. Different VET training and financial regimes in the partner countries meant that different versions of the course were needed. These differences were mainly in length and depth rather than content or learning outcomes.

This was a useful outcome of the distributed CCeD process and impacted on WP 8, the Business Model template. A common approach to evaluating the four VITAE course pilots was devised in collaboration with the WP 5 leader and carried out with instructors and participants as well as collating statistics on effectiveness.

Generating a Business Model

The outcome of the distributed CCeD process was that the partnership recognized that it would be difficult to generate a common business model for the VITAE course. The proposed solution was the development of an adaptive online tool which used the experiences of the four pilots as an illustrative basis to help users build their own tailor-made business plan for a VITAE course. This was possible within the lifetime of the project partly because the issue had been evident as we went through the distributed CCeD process in the early stages.

Valorisation

The Microsoft model illustrated on page 5 provides an effective framework for evaluating how embedded a new pedagogical practice is. There are four products which can be evaluated

- The distributed CCeD approach
- The Business Model tool
- The updated VITAE course
- The Community of Practice (CoP)

The model was introduced too late in the project for evaluation of valorization to built around it but it provides a useful framework for discussion.

Distributed CCeD for example is now a proven procedure and forms part of the services on offer from HiST enabling this remotely located centre to offer CCeD services globally. Using the MS model as reference we could say that distributed CCeD has depth, spread and sustainability though the approach is maybe too young to have achieved shift and evolution.

The Business Model tool evolved from the idea of generic template for the VITAE course and could be generalized to plan for other courses which might be widely applicable across Europe and beyond.

The VITAE course certainly evolved as a result of the distributed CCeD process shifting from a mentoring to a coaching approach and is set for sustainability as an integral part of the HiST catalogue of professional development courses and beyond as a course offered by the new global NooA learning portal where it has shifted to being offered using the Cooperative Freedom approach to learning.

The CoP proved useful as a discussion tool amongst the project network and also for those learners who used the tool as their learning management system as well as being open to the wider public. The CoP also proved robust enough to integrate the eTutor portal, a resource repository from a previous Leonardo project which provided seamless integration for users rather than appearing to be two distinct products each with a different username and password.

Conclusion

Plans were in place to evaluate this project in a timely manner. Experience so far in this project shows a willingness by the project partners to participate in the evaluation activities and in this way ensured that all relevant stakeholders could be kept informed about the progress of the project and could expect that remedial action could be taken in time where necessary.

In preparing the evaluation report all Work Package leaders have been through a process of prior planning of the evaluation process and continued dialogue between WP leaders and myself as leader of the evaluation WP and this ensured that we maintained a coherent approach to evaluation within the project as a whole.

The main conclusion is that the project has shown it is feasible to implement ConCurrent e-learning Design in a distributed environment and that the final product is enhanced by the use of the Business Model Generator approach. The evaluation process picked up some issues from the pilot courses which point to some additional factors which need to be incorporated or dealt with in more detail in the CCeD process such as timing and pacing of VET courses.

UnderstandIT

APPENDIX 1: WP RESULTS

WP 1: Fact sheets

Expected outcomes: To familiarize the project partners with the three prior Leonardo projects which were being used to inform the current project. These would be presented in the form of a factsheet for each of the three projects after internal professional development presenting the three projects.

Quality management tools: In the end the VITAE concept was presented through a model course with partners as participants and observers and this course was evaluated quantitatively and qualitatively.

WP 2: CCeD model adaptation

Expected outcomes: A CCeD process description adapted to the UnderstandIT project, included a Mindmap framework to be used to transfer the Vitae results to new usergroups

Quality management tools: The CCeD process includes evaluation as an embedded part of the process. Note also that this is a research exercise where the process will be more in focus than the results.

The expected outcome from WP2was a description of the Distributed Concurrent Design (DCD) process. This process description can be viewed as a synthesis of experience with DCD in the UnderstandIT project. The following experiences are considered relevant in this context:

- First the process was defined on an overall level by people with experience in CCeD.
- Then the process was presented for all participants in the UnderstandIT project during a co-located workshop in Trondheim, Norway in December 2010.
- In January 2011 the first technical session was conducted to check technical matters such as video transmission quality, access to common documents, etc.
- In the spring of 2011, three distributed cooperation sessions was conducted, all of which were evaluated afterwards.
- In the same period (spring 2011), several meetings among those involved in describing the DCD process was held, and in addition a partner meeting where all project partners where represented was held in Lisbon, Portugal.

This process description contains basic requirements for Distributed Concurrent Design. We consider DCD as a methodological approach that builds on computer supported cooperative work and concurrent design. Successful DCD has an overall need for communication, coordination, collaboration and workspace awareness to support the needed interactions between involved people, the processes and the tools. When we present the requirements for DCD in this process description we have: (1) the introduction which says something about the background of this work, (2) a section with benefits of distributed concurrent design which is largely based on theoretical considerations, (3) a section about the people involved, (4) a section about the process for DCD-projects, (5) a section about appropriate tools, (6) a section that deals with the project deliveries, and (7) a section containing the referred sources.

We consider the surveys and the summaries of these as the most important part of the Quality Management Tools.

WP 3: CCeD work sessions

Aims: To further develop the the Vitae methodology and the Vitae courses.

To use the iQTool QAS tool to secure the content and activities planned for in Vitae.

To make preparation for creating a sustainable business model (WP8) to spread the results (Transfer of innovation) from the Vitae project to new institutions and new countries in Europe.

Working methods: CCeD model

Expected Outcomes:

A design document for Vitae, using iQTool for QAS and eTutor Portal as a repository.

A Business Plan for running Vitae courses in four institutions, in four European countries, with different EDU market situations

A set of evaluation reports

Quality management tools:
A set of evaluation reports. Note also that this is a research exercise where the process will be more in focus than the results.

WP 4: Language & Cultural adaptations

Aim: To find ways of making the Vitae approach and training material available in different languages.

Description: The Vitae approach is using Experience based learning. There is only a small amount of learning material available for the course. Actually it is the VET teachers, trainers and tutors following the course who by their collaboration in the course, defines learning outcomes, develop learning activities, select relevant learning resources and technology for their own courses. (A social constructivistic and learning by doing approach).
This means that there is only a small amount of learning material and resources to be translated. However the Vitae approach in itself must be available in all the four languages. Another activity is to experiment with automated translation. A candidate for this work is the Google translate application. We will try out how this tool can be used as a part of cross national tutoring and mentoring.

Decisions concerning language adaptation
Fact sheets are available in English under Google Docs
Agreed learning outcomes adapted from the Vitae course were translated into the four languages

Decisions concerning cultural adaptation
As decided during the Lisbon meeting the following steps were done in WP 04:
1. Analysis of specific learning cultures in local environments
2. Documentation of design decisions based on local requirements
a. Identify examples of good practice of cultural adoptions
b. Documentation of good practice that others can learn from
3. Accomplish cultural adaption (good practice) guideline

Status
4.1 Analysis of specific learning cultures in local environments
In order to bring out different learning cultures and raise the awareness of the differences FH Koblenz has developed an online-questionnaire by using Google docs. This nine page questionnaire is based on six key questions concerning:

- the organisational model of an educational organisation
- the didactic approach to be followed
- the learning tools to be used
- the structure and origin of the content of a learning course
- the role of peers, of their social environments in the learning process
- their own role in the learning process

The survey was split in three parts targeting three different perspectives / target groups (teacher-trainer, teacher-student and student).

4.2 Documentation of design decisions based on local requirements

This was done by identifying examples of good practice of cultural adoptions and their documentation that others can learn from.

In parallel to the online-questionnaire (based on interim analysis of the result) potential interview partners within our consortium were identified and qualitative interviews carried out in order to identify good practice.

4.3 Cultral Adaption Guideline

As the result of WP 04 FH Koblenz prepared a cultural adaption guideline which raises the awareness of the importance of cultural adoptions and shows good practice examples (at least) from the participating partners, where pilot courses took place. It was originally planned that these guidelines would be ready prior to the VITAE pilot courses running but it soon became apparent that the project should take advantage of the experiences from the pilots and incorporate these into the final product.

WP5: Pilot VITAE courses

The main aim for the WP:

To increase the use of modern web 2.0 based ICT tools by VET teachers, trainers and tutors.

Run training courses in Portugal, Norway, Italy and Lituania

Outcomes:

All 4 countries (Portugal, Lithuania, Norway and Italy) have generated the Vitae course design documents during the four CCeD sessions.

What we agreed for the Vitae course:

- Similar course in each country
- Same learning outcomes
- Same pedagogical approach
- Same timetable (but it has to be flexible)
- We accept both online courses and blended learning
- Number of ECTS (various in different countries)
- Roles: teacher-trainer, teacher-student and student
- Number of students: 6 – 10. Maximum 16 per coach
- A pre-test in the form of a survey to understand the teacher-students skills today

Information from Vitae course design documents published so far:

	Norway	Lithuania	Portugal	Italy
Course topics	Twelve lessons based on the four lessons in the original Vitae Course	Original as in Vitae course with some adaptation	Thirteen Units (lessons), distributed by 3 Modules (based on the four original Modules of the original Vitae Course)	Original as in Vitae course
Number of ECTS, course duration	6 ECTS	1 ECTS, 4 weeks, 30 student hours	2/3 ECTS	150 hours of student work (equivalent to 6 ECTS)

Blended or online	100% online	blended course	Blended course	100% online
When course will take place		2012 (~ March-April)	April-June/2012	March to the first week of June included) with 12 online lectures and exams
Number of participants	Max 16 students for each instance of the course Pilot: 6 - 10 students	6 – 10 students	Max 16 students for each instance of the course Pilot: 6 to 10 students	6 - 10 students
Learning outcomes	No change in learning outcomes	Original as in Vitae course	Original as in Vitae course	The same of the standard VITAE course

The German partner also piloted a short, coaching only, online course. This was not originally foreseen in the UnderstandIT project but reflects activity in the original VITAE project where originally the coaching and ICT training elements were planned to be offered as two separate courses.

Both students and tutors were polled at the end of each pilot. Some conclusions which emerged included:

- Timing of the course is important as it is meant to conclude with an implementation project and during the UnderstandIT project many of the pilot courses concluded just before the summer break.
- The pace of the course was still too intense even after that problem was picked up in the internal partner pilot with several of the partner pilots needing to extend the planned implementation time.
- There is the problem of English interface of many of the recommended tools with no local language equivalent.
- Timely tutor support and presence is critical.

These are general issues which could be given more weight in a revised distributed CCeD process.

WP 6: Community of Practice

Aims: To establish a Web 2.0 workspace where VET teachers, tutors and trainers can exchange ideas. The forum was created as part of the project rather than within an ongoing CoP.

Working Methods: The WP leader polled partners about their needs and wishes regarding the CoP and on the basis of this feedback implemented a local Elgg installation. This integrated

- Partner forums
- Open forums

- Language support (tested with a multi-lingual discussion)
- Course implementation within Elgg (Italian partner)
- Integration of IQ Training Tool
- Integration of Coachmaster software
- Integration of Twitter feed

Quality indicators: Usage statistics, feedback from course participants

CoP functionality evaluation

Since the CoP developed under the scope of WP6 of the Understand IT Project, has most of the functionalities common to the eTutors Portal, and because of this behavior it was clear to the Partnership that the use of both CoP and eTutors Portal becomes redundant, not necessary, and would demand duplication of efforts on maintain updated both the Platforms. To reduce this redundancy, both the Partners, UoR (involved on the CoP development) and CENFIM (involved on the eTutors Portal side), have analyzed and implemented what we think it's the best way to incorporate the eTutors Portal contents & structure into the CoP Platform. This way the CoP Community users is able to access to eTutors Portal contents, and by this way to benefit from all the advantages of that Portal, but without the need for maintaining 2 accounts – as the only required user's accounts to maintain is on the CoP side.

WP 7: Evaluation

Aims: establish efficient procedures for monitoring the project process, to ensure quality control of the project results as well as an evaluation of the project process and project results.
The Evaluation should therefore be qualitative and ongoing from the beginning. The evaluation report should be worked out step by step and follow the whole process.
Working methods: see top of document
Expected outcomes: A set of evaluation reports (see Appendix 7)
Quality indicators:
Significant deviations are identified in a timely fashion and communicated to the project manager.
The project group has a clear idea about whether they are meeting the project objectives.
There is sufficient material for relevant external stakeholders, such as the funding agency, to know that what the project network has done has been evaluated and responded to by the project team.
Quality management tools: A structured series of questionnaires and moderated discussions will used as part of each meeting whether face to face or online. This document also details in Appendix 1 the strategies to be used to evaluate the outcomes in the individual work packages.
Evaluations: There have been both quantitative and qualitative evaluations after every face to face and online meeting. Results of the quantitative evaluations are collated in Google Docs and listed in Appendix 7.

Recommendations, where relevant, have been considered by the appropriate project partners and acted upon wherever possible.

Progress: The project as a whole proceeded on track regarding both products and timetable and the quality of the products is up to or above partner expectations. Where activities deviated from the original plan eg running the VITAE pilot, the results of these have also been evaluated.

WP 8: Generic Business Model for VITAE

Aims: Dissemination and Exploration of results from Leonardo and other EU projects need more attention and a more systematic way of making the work last and be sustainable. The aim of this workpacage is to develop a generic business model, i.e.. a Pattern that can be used by other organizations who will implement the Vitae approach and by similar projects.

Working methods: We will use the handbook written by Alexander Osterwalder & Yves Pigneur, Business Model Generation, 2009, ISBN: 978-2-8399-050-0, as an important tool in the development process.

Expected outcomes: A generic business model (pattern) which can be disseminated via the Business Model Generator website.

Actual outcome: The distributed CCeD process showed that a generic business model was not possible. The WP leader therefore adapted the situation to the building of a digital tool which would aid anyone implementing the VITAE course to generate their own tailored business model.

WP 9: Dissemination and exploitation

Aims:
To make public the results of the work done in the understand IT project both to managers, teachers, and researchers
To organize for a wide spread use of the Vitae approach by Learning centers, VET institutions and universities
Working methods: There are three elements necessary to obtain the first aim:
1) The Generic business model from WP 8
2) The Publication of the model, both in eLearning forums, but also at www.businessmodelgeneration.com
3) Development of a support service to support those institutions who will use the GBM Publications, conference talks, offering support to institutions adopting the GBM *Quality management tools:* Collection of statistics regarding the factors mentioned above.
Outcomes: Dissemination activities have been documented and included articles (popular and academic), conference presentations both face to face and online, blog posts and so on.
The VITAE course now forms part of the course catalogue in Lithuania, Italy, Norway and Portugal.
The VITAE course and an introduction to distributed ConCurrent Design is offered by global online learning portal WiZiQ from Denmark in English.
The VITAE course is offered via the new NooA Global Learning Portal in Danish and English.
Outreach: The CoP integrated the Coachmaster software authored by a UK coach who was willing to work with the project.

WP 10: Project management

Aims:

a) Be contractual partner versus SIU in Norway
This is an ongoing activity. SIU have appointed Anne Hunderi and Alisa Hodzic as our contact persons.

b) Be contractual partner between HiST, AITeL and all the other partners
All contracts have been made and the first and second instalments have been paid.

c) Make project results available through a project web site
The project web site for UnderstandIT can be found at: http://aitel.hist.no/understandit/.

d) Organize Partner meetings
e) Follow up progress and activities between the meetings
To follow up activities between the F-2-F Partner meetings the following tools are used:

- The e-mail list: understandIT@hist.no, for asynchronous communication
- Adobe connect, for synchronous communication
- A Google docs archive where all project documents and results are placed. The google docs are also used for administrative purposes, i.e. contracts, project handbook etc.

The Google docs are updated simultaneously on a daily basis by all the partners.

The Adobe connect has both been used for the development work in WP-3, but also for communicating about administrative and other issues. We plan to use it throughout the whole project.

f) Implement a QAS for the project and evaluate the activities and results are according to defined QA standards
We have developed a QMPlan for Understand IT. This tool organizes evaluations related to every activities and outcomes in the project. The evaluation is carried out using Google docs questionnaires.

g) Follow up that expenditure is in accordance with the approved budget
All partners deliver salary forms travel bills etc every third month. HiST checks that the spending are legal, related to the project activities and reasonable compared with the work done so far, all in accordance with the Leonardo project handbook.

h) Report to SIU on progress, products and other result
Working methods: Administration, accounting, communication, conflict resolution

Expected outcomes:

Interim and final reports

Project website

See: http://aitel.hist.no/understandit/

Quality management tools: These are various and include

Finance: Automated accountancy systems

Website: Statistics on visitors and their behavior

Project meetings: facilitated face to face discussion and structured questionnaires

For Quality management we developed a QMPlan as a guideline for all our quality assurance activities.

Accounting:

· Rules of accounting from Leonardo / SIU were presented at PM1

· Forms used for reporting were presented and published at Google docs

APPENDIX 2: LINKS TO PREVIOUS EVALUATION REPORTS

PM1: Trondheim
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1PEVTHa0yfsTn3zLYAPHcSxZiy8wIlM6wU7PccYdO0jM/edit?hl=en_GB&authkey=CN3so8EO#

PM2: Lisbon

https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=explorer&chrome=true&srcid=0B0NGxBweTdT4M2ZjMmNlMjAtYTk3MS00YTFhLThmMzAtNDVkMDMwZDMwNTc0&hl=en_GB

CCeD1: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1s4GVfiNNjlUKKJXVGQ4h-UHx8EcXVenjasT4T-AXzFg/edit?hl=en_GB#

CCeD2:
https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=explorer&chrome=true&srcid=0B0NGxBweTdT4NDgwNjYxYWQtZGRmNy00ZjgzLWI5OWYtODM4ZDhlM2U5YTMz&hl=en_GB

CCeD3:
https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=explorer&chrome=true&srcid=0B0NGxBweTdT4NjM5ODdlZWItMzBlMS00YmI0LThhOTMtMmIyYWQxYTc1OGMx&hl=en_GB

CCeD3b:
https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=explorer&chrome=true&srcid=0B0NGxBweTdT4NjM5ODdlZWItMzBlMS00YmI0LThhOTMtMmIyYWQxYTc1OGMx&hl=en_GB

Quality Plan:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qTf01344mp80lCosO0gLseNoFzF4cP6rmHE6gkeLstk/edit?hl=en_GB#

Lisbon summary of WP7 to date:
https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=explorer&chrome=true&srcid=0B0NGxBweTdT4ZmExM2NjNjYtNjBlZS00MTA5LTlhMzYtMGJiMGFhNjM1YmVh&hl=en_GB

VITAE Partner Pilot course evaluation:
https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=explorer&chrome=true&srcid=0B0NGxBweTdT4N2M4YzY3MjYtY2VmNC00NzBkLTkwMTUtNmQ3YzliYTM2OGQ0&hl=en_GB

VITAE Pilots evaluation